

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,978,589 (Yoon) and rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,658 (Haun).

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 1-10 have been allowed.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of independent Claim 11, Claim 11 has been amended and is further distinguished.

Yoon teaches a loading method of a base station in a digital cellular system in which lower processors request files from upper processors and that “[t]he multidrop loading system distinguishes the processors from one another according to the layer or level” (e.g., see, Column 2, Lines 32-33).

In contrast to that which is taught by Yoon, amended Claim 11 includes the recitation of the control unit includes a main processor for executing the execution file for operating the plurality of target boards, reading the target board ID of each target board,

and initializing target board hardware according to the target board ID, which is neither taught nor suggested by Yoon. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of Claim 11 be withdrawn.

Moreover, regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of dependent Claim 12, Claim 12 has been amended and is further distinguished.

Yoon is discussed above with respect to the rejection of Claim 11.

Haun discloses a method and apparatus for supplying a reliable and maintainable operating system in a net-booted environment.

In contrast, amended Claim 12 includes the recitation of wherein the main processor initializes an operating system (OS) for each target board using the target board ID, and branches into a sub-routine for each target board according to the target board ID, which is neither taught nor suggested by either Yoon or Haun or the combination thereof. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 12 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 11 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Without

conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claim 12, this Claim 12 is believed to be allowable by virtue of its dependence on independent Claim 11. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent Claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-12, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml